

Appln No. 10/780624  
Amdt. Dated: December 28, 2006  
Response to Office Action of October 27, 2006

4

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In response to the Examiner's further Office Action of October 27, 2006 issued with respect to the present RCE application, the Applicant respectfully submits the accompanying Amendment to the claims and the below Remarks.

#### ***Regarding Amendment***

In the Amendment:

claim 1 is amended to replace "the public key" with --a public key-- at line 4;  
claim 2 is cancelled; and  
claims 3, 4 and 6 are unchanged.

It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments do not add new matter to the present application.

#### ***Regarding 35 USC 112, first paragraph Rejections***

The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the enablement rejection over claim 2, based on the above-discussed amendment cancelling claim 2.

#### ***Regarding 35 USC 112, second paragraph Rejections***

##### ***Regarding Claim 1***

It is respectfully submitted that the above-discussed amendment to claim 1 to replace "the public key" with --a public key-- at line 4, provides sufficient antecedent basis in this claim.

##### ***Regarding Claim 2***

The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the clarity rejection of claim 2, based on the above-discussed amendment cancelling claim 2.

#### ***Regarding 35 USC 102(b) and 103(a) Rejections***

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of pending independent claims 1 and 6, and dependent claims 3 and 4, is not disclosed or suggested by newly cited Koenig (US 4,590,470), for at least the following reasons.

Pending independent claims 1 and 6 clearly recite that the first integrated circuit stores, and applies the respective function based on, a secret key and the second integrated circuit stores and applies the respective function based on, a public key. In this way, the secret key is not divulged during the validation process (see page 39, line 4-page 40, line 13 of the present specification).

On the other hand, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Koenig merely discloses a public key two-function concept, in which both of the functions, f and g, are carried out based on public keys, not one public key and one secret key as required by the presently claimed invention. Furthermore, there is no motivation from the disclosure of Koenig for one of ordinary skill in the art to replace one of the public keys with a secret key, because Koenig specifically discloses that secrecy of the user's function is maintained by providing the user with an authenticating device having only two ports (see abstract and col. 3, line 50-col. 4, line 40 of Koenig).

Appln No. 10/780624  
Amdt. Dated: December 28, 2006  
Response to Office Action of October 27, 2006

5

Thus, the subject matter of pending (and amended) claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 is not taught or suggested by Koenig.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's rejections have been traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:



---

Kia Silverbrook

---

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762